



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/815,052

03/31/2004

Jesper Kiehn

M61.12-0615

7946

27366

7590

05/31/2007

WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)

SUITE 1400

900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319

EXAMINER

HOFFMAN, BRANDON S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2136

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/31/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/815,052

Applicant(s)

KIEHN ET AL.

Examiner

Brandon S. Hoffman

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-18,20-34 and 36-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-18,20-34 and 36-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-18, 20-34, and 36-39 are pending in this office action.
2. In view of the appeal brief filed on January 25, 2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

Rejections

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 18 and 20-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 18 is not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of applicants' disclosure, specification page 9, line 26, through page 10, line 19, the medium is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g., RAM, ROM, flash memory) and intangible embodiments (e.g., carrier waves, wireless media). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory. Claims 20-33 are dependent upon claim 18 and therefore inherit its deficiencies.

6. Claims 1, 3-18, 20-34, and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility.

Claims 1, 18, and 34 lack a concrete, tangible result. Claim 1 recites a method, however the method lacks a useful, tangible concrete result. The final output of the method is the creation of an association object, which is an abstract idea. It therefore fails to produce a tangible, real-world result. Claim 18 is similar to claim 1.

Claim 34 recites a system, however the components of the "system" are an REA model and a security model. These models are at best, functional descriptive material. Note MPEP 2106.01 for guidance on computer related non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 3-17, 20-33, and 36-39 are dependent upon claims 1, 18, and 34, and therefore inherit their deficiencies.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claims 1, 3-18, 20-34, and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boozer et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0205355 A1) in view of Tingey (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0133583).

Regarding claims 1, 18, and 34, Boozer et al. teaches a method/system/computer readable medium for providing Resource-Event-Agent (REA) model based security, the method/system/computer readable medium comprising:

- Identifying an REA defined association of a type which dictates ownership between a first object and a second object (page 1, paragraph 0016);
- Creating an association class for the REA defined association between the first object and second object, the association class defining security between the first object and the second object (page 1, paragraph 0018).

Boozer et al. does not specifically teach REA models and wherein creating the association class object for the association between the first object and the second object further comprises creating an association class object having properties defining security between the first object and the second object.

Tingey teaches REA models (fig. 1), and wherein creating the association class object for the association between the first object and the second object further

comprises creating an association class object having properties defining security between the first object and the second object (paragraph 0066).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine creating an association class object having properties, the properties of the association class object defining the security between the first object and the second object, as taught by Tingey, with the method/system/computer readable medium of Boozer et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because objects have properties that define the attributes of the object. The attributes define the object and therefore define the security between the two objects.

Regarding claims 3, 20, and 36, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein creating the association class object further comprises creating one or more association class objects having properties, properties of the one or more association class objects defining security between a first class of objects of which the first object is a member and a second class of objects of which the second object is a member (see paragraph 0066 of Tingey).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein the second object is a securable object (see page 1, paragraph 0018 of Boozer et al., the objects may have security parents).

Regarding claims 5 and 21, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein the first object is of a particular agent type, and wherein a role for a user is defined by the particular agent type for the first object (see page 6, paragraph 0066 and 0076 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 6-10 and 22-26, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein the second object is a contract or agreement type object, a commitment type object, an event type object, a resource type object, and an agent type object (see fig. 1 of Tingey, REA model contains all of the mentioned object types).

Regarding claims 11, 12, 27, and 28, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein identifying the REA defined association of the type which dictates ownership between the first object and the second object further comprises identifying an REA defined [control type/custody type] association between the first object and the second object (see page 1, paragraph 0016 and page 3, paragraph 0033 of Boozer et al., control meaning 'ownership' and custody meaning 'template').

Regarding claims 13 and 29, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein creating the REA defined association class object for the association between the first object and the second object further comprises creating the association class object in a security model (see page 1, paragraph 0016 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 14, 30, and 37, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein creating the association class object in the security model further comprises creating the association class object in the security model separate from the REA model (see fig. 19, ref. num 1200 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 15, 31, and 38, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein creating the association class object in the security model further comprises creating the association class object in the security model as part of the REA model (see fig. 2 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 16, 32, and 39, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein defining security between the first object and the second object further comprises defining permissions and rights of the first object relative to the second object (see page 2/3, paragraph 0029 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 17 and 33, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Tingey teaches wherein defining permissions and rights of the first object relative to the second object further comprises dynamically determining the permissions and rights in a security policy logic module outside of the security model (see paragraph 0066 of Tingey).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon S. Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser G. Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brandon S. Hoffman

BH

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

[Signature]

5/26/07